

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated August 8, 2006. Claims 1-8 are pending and stand rejected. Applicant has amended the specification to include priority information previously submitted in the patent application transmittal letter (data sheet) and also included in the declaration as filed with the Response to Notice to File Missing Parts. Claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 have been amended. Applicant submits that no new matter was added by these additions or amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Transmittal of Priority Document Under 35 USC § 120**

Responsive to the Office Action of August 8, 2006, Applicant hereby confirms his claim of priority under 35 USC § 120: International Application No. PCT/EP02/09388 filed August 22, 2002 and designating the U.S. which claims priority from EP Application No. 01123076.0 filed September 26, 2001.

**Priority Rejections**

The Examiner noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. PCT/EP02/09388, filed August 22, 2002 and notes that the reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification. Applicant has amended the specification accordingly and requests that the Examiner withdraw the priority rejections. In addition, a certified copy of the priority application will be provided at a later date.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant respectfully disagrees, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 to move prosecution forward. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. While Applicant respectfully disagrees, Applicant has amended claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,895,586 issued to Brasher et al. ("*Brasher*"). Applicant respectfully submits that Brasher fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Thus, Brasher fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, "wherein the first computer has a message generator that receives type-object hierarchy information from the application and that provides a message with a type chain in parent-child direction and an object chain also in parent-child direction, wherein the type chain includes a type node associated with a target object and the object chain includes an object node associated with the target object, a combination of the type node and the object node identify the target object that corresponds to the target component, a combination of the descendants of the type node and the descendants of the object node correspond to parent components." In particular, claim 1 recites, "a combination of the type node and the object node identify the target object that corresponds to the target component, a combination of the descendants of the type node and the descendants of the object node correspond to parent components." Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to cite any passages that teach or suggest the target component or the parent components. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 recite limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, these claims as well as their dependents are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 2 is rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,731,735 issued to Borgendale et al. ("Borgendale"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. In addition, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* in view of Tanenbaum, Andrew S. "Computer Networks." Third Edition, Prentice Hall PTR, 1996; pages 630-643, ("Tanenbaum"). Applicants traverse these rejections and all findings and assertions therein. In particular, these depend from one of independent claims 1 and 4. As discussed above, independent Claims 1 and 4 are allowable over *Brasher*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Borgendale* and *Tanenbaum* of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, claims 2 and 5 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable claims 1 and 5. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2006

/Michael E. Cox/

Michael E. Cox  
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **32864**

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107  
Fax: (214) 747-2091

90192565.doc